

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the Office Action mailed December 8, 2005, submitted concurrently with a one month extension of time to extend the due date for response to April 8, 2006.

By this Amendment, claims 8 and 9 has been amended to be in independent form and to more particularly define the present invention. Further, claims 1-7, 10, 13 and 15 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to their underlying subject matter. Further, new claims 17-24 have been added to further protect specific embodiments of the present invention. Support for the claim amendments and new claims can be found throughout the specification and the original claims, see, for example, canceled claims 1-6 and page 12, line 21 to page 13, line 1, of the specification. Thus, claims 8, 9, 11, 12, 14 and 16-24 are pending in this application.

In view of these amendments, Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Konig et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,242,410). This rejection has been rendered moot by the cancellation of the rejected claims.

Claims 1, 3-7 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Pedain et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,895,883). This rejection has been rendered moot by the cancellation of the rejected claims.

Claims 1, 4-6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Brindell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,148,950). With regard to claims 1 and 4-6, this rejection has been rendered moot by the cancellation of these same claims. With regard to claim 8, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

To constitute anticipation of the claimed invention under U.S. practice, the prior art reference must literally or inherently teach each and every limitation of the claims. Here, in this case, Brindell et al. fails to teach the limitation “*wherein the amino group-containing compound (A), the ketone compound (B), the ketimine compound (C), and the water (D) are in equilibrium or in stable coexistence by a equilibrium relationship*” of the amended claims.

Brindell et al. describes a composition containing water. However, as described in Example I, when the composition is a two-part composition, the main agent (resin component) contains water which is distinguishable from the present invention where the curing agent contains water. In addition, the curing agent described in Brindell et al. does not have “*the amino group-containing compound (A), the ketone compound (B), the ketimine compound (C), and the water (D) in equilibrium or in stable coexistence by a equilibrium relationship*”.

Thus, since Brindell et al. fails to teach all the claim limitations, the presently claimed invention is not anticipated by Brindell et al.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102/§103

Claims 1, 3 and 6-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Okuhira et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,271,333). With regard to claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 10, 13 and 15, this rejection has been rendered moot by the cancellation of these same claims. With regard to claims 8, 9, 11, 12, 14 and 16, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As stated above, to constitute anticipation of the claimed invention under U.S. practice, the prior art reference must literally or inherently teach each and every limitation of the claims. Further, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the cited reference must either alone or in combination teach or suggest the invention as a whole, including all the limitations of the claims. Here, in this case, Okuhira et al., like Brindell et al., fails to teach the limitation “*wherein the amino group-containing compound (A), the ketone compound (B), the ketimine compound (C), and the water (D) are in equilibrium or in stable coexistence by a equilibrium relationship*” of the amended claims.

Okuhira et al. is directed to a room-temperature curable one part moisture curable composition. However, nowhere in Okuhira et al. does it describe a composition containing water. Further, the curing agent described in Okuhira et al. does not have “*the amino group-containing compound (A), the ketone compound (B), the ketimine compound (C), and the water (D) in equilibrium or in stable coexistence by a equilibrium relationship*”.

Thus, since Okuhira et al. fails to teach all the claim limitations, the presently claimed invention is not anticipated by or rendered obvious over Okuhira et al.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, all the claims now pending in the present application are believed to be clearly patentable over the outstanding rejections. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of the claims in light of the above remarks is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

Dated: April 7, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

David T. Nikaido

Registration No.: 22,663

Lee Cheng

Registration No.: 40,949

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

1233 20th Street, N.W.

Suite 501

Washington, DC 20036

(202) 955-3750

Attorneys for Applicant